
HUMAN USES

Characterization

Major Human Uses in the South Fork Coos Watershed:

- Industrial forestry - timber production.
- Federal forest lands are managed following an ecosystem management philosophy.
- Agriculture and rural residential are the dominant uses on the major bottom lands and the adjacent uplands.
- Recreational activities include recreational driving, camping, hunting, picnicking, hiking, moterized trail riding, and boat and shoreline fishing.
- Special forest products collection for commercial and personal use.
- Domestic water source for Myrtle Point and the city of Coquille is the Coquille River and Rink Creek Reservoir.

Map USE-1 shows the location of recreation sites, power line right of ways, communication sites, BLM maintenance shop, and communities.

Native American Interests and Treaty Rights: Two federally-recognized Native American organizations have interests in the analysis area. They are the Confederated tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians (CTCLUSI) and the Coquille Indian Tribe (CIT). Official representatives of the United States signed two treaties with Indians from the Coquille River area (in 1851 and 1855), but neither was ratified by the U.S. Senate. Therefore, specific Native American treaty rights do not exist on public lands in this analysis area. Of course, Federal law and policy concerning Native American cultural resources still apply, regardless of the status of treaty rights.

The CTCLUSI was federally recognized by Public Law 98-481 on October 17, 1984. On December 22, 1993, the CTCLUSI and the Coos Bay BLM District signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for coordination of management issues(on file at Coos Bay BLM District office). The CTCLUSI has provided identification of Areas of Interest within the Coos Bay BLM District, which includes major portions of the analysis area (all areas north of T. 29 S.).

The CIT was federally recognized by Public Law 101-42 on June 28, 1989. On March 17, 1997 the CIT and Coos Bay BLM District signed an MOU for coordination on management of public lands (on file at Coos Bay BLM District office).

The CIT maintains an active interest in locations of prehistoric human presence and historic Native American land use on public land within the Coquille Subbasin. Knowledge of specific places and locations of tribal interest are based on recorded or documented evidence, reported speculation, and oral history. The following physiographic and/or resource-based descriptions of potentially important areas have been adapted, with permission, from a draft CIT policy statement (Coquille Indian Tribe 1997).

Physical features of interest to the CIT in riverine/stream locations include the vicinities of:

- The present (and past) head(s) of tidewater;
- Intertidal zones in bays or estuaries, and;
- Confluences of anadromous fish-bearing tributary streams.

Upland localities of interest to the CIT include:

- Meadows, prairies, and other open spaces near perennial water sources;
- Rock outcrops/bluffs with the potential for panoramic views, and;

- Areas with unique physical, floral, or faunal attributes, such as places where important plant species thrive (in abundance or size) or important animal/bird species congregate.

In addition, the CIT expressed interest in conserving places with botanical/faunal conditions connected with traditional collecting, gathering, and hunting/fishing activities, such as:

- Migratory routes and gathering places of important big game animals (e.g., bear, elk and deer);
- Wetland/woodland habitats for raptors (e.g., osprey, hawk, and eagle) and/or small game species (e.g. beaver, otter, raccoon, and coyote);
- Woodland bird habitats (e.g., woodpecker, blue jay, and owl);
- Forest environments where important tree (e.g., cedar, spruce, hemlock, and yew), berry (e.g., salmonberry and huckleberry) and/or nut producing tree and/or shrub (e.g. myrtle and hazel) species thrive, and;
- Places where traditionally-used indigenous plants prosper (e.g., camas, iris, beargrass and ferns).

Local Concerns:

Residents and landowners in this watershed have expressed concerns about:

- Reduction in the BLM forestry program and the subsequent loss of jobs.
- Fear that an aggressive road closure program would cause loss of access across Federal land to private land.
- Fear that government will infringe on private property rights.
- Herbicide applications may result in drift onto private property or contaminate domestic water sources located on federal land. At least one resident makes his living raising certified organically grown produce and any chemical contamination would result in loss of certification and loss of crop value.
- Declines in salmon and eel populations.
- Potential loss of use of streamside areas on private land due to water quality and endangered species issues.

The concerns an individual may express are often tied to issues of livelihood. For example, the people most likely to express a concern over the loss of timber jobs are people who work for the timber industry. Farmers may also express concern for a loss of forestry related jobs. However, farmers tend to be much more passionate over possible loss of the use of their land to regulatory restrictions and to the possible impacts to their land caused by upstream activities. Residents often express both a concern for the drop in salmon populations and for the possibility that government could impose regulations intended to recover salmon populations that would take away property rights and restrict their ability to earn a living.

Current Condition

Approximately 70 to 90 different landowners own property in each of the subwatersheds in this assessment area. These include rural residential, family farms, timber companies and absentee landowners. The community of Fairview lies within the Watershed at the junction of the Coquille-Fairview County Road and the Coos Bay Wagon Road. It is near the confluence of Evans Creek and North Fork Coquille River.

The nearest full service towns to the Watershed are the county seat Coquille, population 4,235, and Myrtle Point, population 2,725. Coquille's water supply comes from the Coquille River and Rink Creek Reservoir. Myrtle Point's water supply comes from the North Fork Coquille River. Additional information is available on a website maintained by The Oregon Economic Development Department:

- Coquille Community Profile - <http://www.econ.state.or.us/PCOQUILL.HTM>
- Myrtle Point Community Profile - <http://www.econ.state.or.us/PMYRTLEP.HTM>
- Links to other community profiles in the county and region - <http://www.econ.state.or.us/comprof.htm>

The forest products/logging industry remains the largest private sector employer in both Coquille and

Myrtle Point. Other employers include city, county and state governments, schools, and medical facilities.

We have no employment or business trend statistics specific to the North Fork Coquille Watershed. However, economic trends inside the watershed can be inferred from trends for nearby communities, the county, and region. The Oregon Labor Market Information System web site <http://www.olmis.org> has links to regional economic and workforce trends. The regional economic report addressing economic workforce conditions and trends for the Coos/ Curry Region is accessible from the following web page: <http://olmis.emp.state.or.us/olmisj/OlmisZine?zineid=00000010>. The 2000 Regional Economic Profile Region 7 Coos County Curry County, <http://www.olmis.org/pubs/rep1999/pdf/rep07.pdf>, provides a regional overview that includes demographic economic and employment trends. The Oregon Economic & Community Development Department has several web pages profiling the Southwest Oregon Region and Coos County:

- Overview of the Southwest Oregon Region - <http://www.econ.state.or.us/swres.htm>
- Coos County Economic Indicators - <http://www.econ.state.or.us/SWCEICOO.HTM>
- The Oregon Labor Market information for Coos County is accessible through the Oregon Employment Department web page - http://www.olmis.org/olmis/olmtest.reg_output?p_areacode=000007

Coos County's population fell by 1,450 (-2.3% between 1994 and 1999). Since 1994, more people have moved out than have moved in to the County, and deaths exceeded births. The county's median age of 40 years is one of the highest in that state. Coos County has seen a large reduction in nonfarm employment and income during the last decade. These losses were in the forest products, fishing, related transportation services, ship repair and forestry among other sectors. Manufacturing jobs fell substantially in the last decade. In the same period, nonmanufacturing jobs increased by 3,300 (+21%). Most of the increase in nonmanufacturing jobs occurred in trade, services, and local government and tribal activities¹. The nonfarm jobs in 2000 totaled 20,830. Of this, 2,570 were manufacturing and 19,190 were nonmanufacturing. The unemployment rate for Coos County in 2000 was 6.6%. The estimated poverty rate in 1995 was 17.8%, third highest in the state (State of Oregon Employment Dept. 2000).

From 1988 to 1998, total manufacturing employment, in Coos and Curry Counties dropped by nearly 2,100 jobs (-37%). Nearly 2,000 of those lost jobs were in the lumber and forest products industry. Mill closings and job losses in the timber industry are the result of reductions in timber availability, competition from other producers, and obsolescence (State of Oregon Employment Dept. 1999b). Obsolescence was the result in a shift from an industry based on large old-growth logs to small second-growth logs. Few mills currently operate in southwest Oregon that can handle large logs. Even so, the timber industry remains the largest manufacturing sector in Coos and Curry Counties².

From 1990 to 1999, agricultural employment in Coos County peaked at 610 in 1991 and 1997, and dipped to 440 in 1993. The 1999 agriculture employment was 560 <http://www.olmis.org/pubs/ag/coos.pdf>. Coos and Curry County agricultural income, in order of gross farm sales, comes from speciality products, small fruits and berries, dairy products, cattle and calves, other live stock, and other crops. The speciality products category includes small wood lot sales (State of Oregon Employment Dept. 1999b).

Sources of income, in Coos County, have shifted considerably in the last 30 years as shown in Table HU-

¹ In Coos and Curry Counties, total government employment had an increase of 28% between 1988 and 1998 adding 1,380 jobs. The net increase was due to increases in state, and local government employment. The federal employment fell by 30% during that period. State employment rose partly because of the "boot camp" prison north of Coos Bay. Nearly half of local government employment is in education, which includes the community college. Nearly 20% of local government is health care related. More than 500 tribal sector jobs are included in the local government figures (State of Oregon Employment Dept. 1999b)

² Oregon State Employment now considers logging positions (choker setters-hooktenders) in the Gold Beach/Brookings areas, and hooktenders in the Coos Bay area to be "hard to fill job orders." This is because there are few qualified, experienced, and physically fit local applicants. Most of the people qualified to fill these jobs have moved out of the area (State of Oregon Employment Dept. 1999b).

1. The 1997 per capita income for Coos County averaged \$19,494. This is 82% of the estimated per capita income of \$23,920 for Oregon (State of Oregon Employment Dept. 1999a).

Table HU-1: Percent of Personal Income by Source

	Oregon		Coos County	
	1967	1997	1967	1997
Net earnings	76.8%	65.1%	80.5%	53.5%
Dividends, interest, and income from rentals	13.6%	18.4%	10.2%	20.2%
Transfer payments: Social Security, other retirement payments, Medicare, veterans' benefits, and income maintenance payments such as food stamps and unemployment insurance.	9.6%	16.5%	9.3%	26.3%

Bureau of Economic Analysis data reported by State of Oregon Employment Dept. in 1999

Southwest Oregon is recognized as economically depressed. Local and state efforts are underway to change this. One area being pursued is tourism. The Coos County Tourism Plan of 1996 states on page A-5: "In planning for tourism we will have to note that beaches and fishing represent the two most important attractions for summer visitors as well."

The Coquille Watershed Association: Fisheries are a big topic throughout the state. Declining numbers of fish species with high commercial and recreational values have resulted in concerned people working together to improve fish populations by improving their habitat. One active group is the Coquille Watershed Association, a nonprofit corporation. The Association's Action Plan, pages 1-7 and 1-8 states:

A comprehensive watershed management program was initiated in Oregon in 1993 to address the complex natural resource issues facing Oregon. This strategy entails a long term commitment by local, state and federal land managers, private landowners, and private citizens to address watershed protection, enhancement, and restoration in an effort to restore watershed health throughout Oregon.... The Association is comprised of a broad array of participants with interests, livelihoods, or land ownership found in the Coquille watershed.

The Association works to improve water quality and habitat primarily for anadromous fish. They target private lands or specific sites identified in inventory or analysis stages. They work with landowners on specific projects such as culvert replacement, in-stream structure placement, planting vegetation along streams and fencing livestock.

County Operated Recreation Sites: LaVerne County Park is the most popular developed recreation site in the Watershed, and is located on the North Fork Coquille River about 15 miles northeast of Coquille. Numerous myrtle trees and conifers, common in the Coast Range, grow inside the park. The original park area of 120 acres has increased to 237.5 acres, which includes group areas south of the main park. It is a treasured resource for county residents and a growing number of retirees in motor-homes. Conservative estimates from park personnel indicate 5,000 people are in the park on summer holiday weekends. In comparison, figures from 1978 showed 15,000 day-use visitors, and 4,100 visitors camping from June to August (USDI 1978).

Coos County has two small, primitive campgrounds on county land in the watershed. They are Bennett Park along the North Fork Coquille River and Hambunch Cherry Creek County Park at the Cherry Creek and Fairview-McKinley County Road intersection. Both appear to receive light use. Five park sites on BLM land, totaling nearly 528 acres, were withdrawn to Coos County for the "care, control and management" for recreational purposes back in 1926. Three of these are in the North Fork Coquille Watershed. One is LaVerne Park. The two others are Rock Prairie and Middle Creek, which are undeveloped. These sites are characterized in Table HU-2.

These county park withdrawals are not covered by the Forest Plan because they were withdrawn from federal public lands to be administered in perpetuity by Coos County, on May 5, 1926 through Public Law 181, BLM case file (OR21318)³. This action predates the Northwest Forest Plan and the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1954 (R&PP). The R&PP Act is a complete revision of the 1926 Public Law 181. The R&PP Act authorizes the sale or lease of public lands for recreational or public purposes to state and local governments and to qualified nonprofit organizations.

The ROD/RMP (USDI 1995, pg 49) management directions for recreation land leases are to “Implement no action that will compromise the purpose of developed sites/areas which are under existing Recreation and Public Purpose Act leases to other agencies. When existing leases for these sites expire, reevaluate their relevance, on a case-by-case basis, in light of current BLM management objectives.” There is no expiration date for the county’s administrative authority for the lands withdrawn in 1926. The county may relinquish the withdrawal through a standard procedure beginning with a written request to BLM to relinquish the “permanent lease.” BLM has no discretion or responsibility with park administration, operations and maintenance with the exception of harvesting trees. If the county plans to sell any trees, they must work with BLM regarding the sale.

Table HU-2 BLM land withdrawal May 5, 1926 through Public Law 181 and/or by R&PP Act lease to Coos County for Parks in the North Fork Coquille Watershed

Park Name	Withdrawal and location	Acres	Use	Improvements	Other
LaVerne Park	1926 Act of Congress: N ½SE¼ & SWNE, Sect. 5, T.27S.,R.11W.	120	high in summer	Flush toilets, showers, water taps, electric hook-ups	-Camping, day use, swimming - BLM land use allocations are Connectivity and Riparian Reserve
LaVerne Park extension	R&PP lease: all or a portion of S½NW¼ & N½SW¼, Sect. 5, T.27S.,R.11W.	117.5			
Rock Prairie	1926 Act of Congress: E½SW¼ & S½SE¼, Sect. 35, T.27S.,R.12W.	160	low	undeveloped	- site of the Scout Cabin, which was demolished in the late 1970's/ early 1980's - BLM land use allocations are Connectivity and Riparian Reserve
Middle Creek	1926 Act of Congress: W½SW¼, Sect. 5, T.28S.,R.11W.	80	low	undeveloped	- largely intact riparian myrtle stand - BLM land use allocations are GFMA and Riparian Reserve

³ According to the Burnt Mountain Unit Resource Analysis (USDI 1978), “The purpose of the withdraw is to set apart as public parks and camp sites for recreational purposes and to preserve rare groves of myrtle trees on the area. Withdrawals are on CBWR lands only. Responsibility for control and management of the area is the County Court of Coos County, Oregon. The management has been delegated to the County Parks and Recreation Department; however, the responsibility remains with the County Court. Timber title remains with the United States. Further information concerning timber rights and United States rights to cut timber within the withdrawal area can be found in case file OR 6398.”



Figure 1 original caption: May 1950
Falls on the North Fork of Coquille River at LaVern Park. LaVern Park is one of the CBWR areas set aside by Congress in 1925 to be administered by Coos County for park purposes. This tract is located in Sec. 5, T.27S.,R.11W.



Figure 2 original caption: May 1950
Myrtle Grove at LaVern Park. A typical stand of virgin myrtle trees. LaVern Park is one of the CBWR areas set aside by Congress in 1925 to be administered by Coos County for park purposes. This tract is located in Sec. 5, T.27S.,R.11W.

BLM Recreation Sites: BLM maintains and administers three recreation sites within the Watershed. Park Creek and Big Tree are official recreation sites. McKinley Camp is officially a proposed recreation site, but has been regularly used for group camping for decades. Dead end spurs, old landings, quarries, and rock stockpile areas, particularly where these types of sites are near water, are commonly used for disbursed camping. The past and current levels of disbursed camping and day use recreation are not documented. However, casual observation suggests the over all recreational use in the watershed is on the increase. The Burnt Mountain Road, Burnt Mountain-Middle Creek Tie Road and the Middle Creek Road are on the “Growing Forest Tour” route. These are also the main access routes to the Dorner Fir trail from the west. These and other paved roads in the Watershed are used for recreational driving and bicycling. Table HU-3, below lists the existing rec sites, and the proposed recreation areas listed in the RMP.

Table HU-3 Existing, Proposed, and Potential Recreation Facilities

Park Name	Size	Use	Improvements	Other
<u>Park Creek Developed</u>	60 acres. 4.75 acres are developed	picnicking and camping in the summer and during hunting season.	sixteen camp sites with fire rings, grills, tables, garbage cans and two potable well water hand pumps. Four vault toilets. Gravel roads.	Other BLM designations are Riparian Reserve and LSR. Camping, hiking, relaxing, exploring and hunting. Set in Myrtlewood grove. Summer and hunting season use, little if any use in winter.
<u>Big Tree Developed</u>	20 acres 1/4 acre is developed	summer day use	vault toilet, three tables, three fire rings, a short trail with three bridges	Other BLM designations are Riparian Reserve and LSR. Day use only.
Big Bend	not defined	N/A	undeveloped	- RMP <u>proposed site</u>
Mckinley Camp	12 acres	group camping	2.5 acre open field mowed twice a year	- RMP <u>proposed site</u> - currently used as a group campsite by permit
Blue Ridge Trail	N/A	hiking and riding	N/A	- Trail suitable for hiking, mountain bikes and horses
Mckinley Camp Trail	N/A	N/A	N/A	- RMP <u>proposed trail</u> - preliminary work suggest trail construction may be difficult due to terrain and may need to obtain permission to cross private land
Vaughns Creek Big Tree Trail	N/A	low use	N/A	- unofficial and unmaintained
Big Tree Park Trail	N/A	low use	N/A	- 1/4 mile inside Big Tree Park and 1/4 mile in the Cherry Creek Research Natural Area. The part of the trail inside the Natural area is blocked by storm damage and no longer maintained because recreational use has the potential to conflict with the science research and education purposes of the Research Natural Area.
Coos Mountain Lookout	--	--	--	- not listed in the ROD/RMP. Potential to convert an existing closed road into a trail.
North Fork Coquille	--	--	--	- not listed in the ROD/RMP. Potential to convert an existing closed road into a trail.
Alder Creek	--	--	--	- not listed in the ROD/RMP. Potential to convert an existing closed road into a trail.

Park Creek - Recreation Site is located on Middle Creek Road, 16 miles northeast of Coquille. It is the only developed BLM Campground in the Watershed. Eighty acres were withdrawn from mineral entry and designated for use as a recreation site by Public Land Order 3869, on November 21, 1965. In 1981, 20 acres were revoked from the original withdraw leaving 60 acres. The developed part of the park covers 4.75 acres. The developed part of the park is in a myrtle grove. The rest of the park is forested with old-growth conifers with hardwood and conifer understory trees on the uplands. Streamside areas support hardwoods with scattered conifer.

This flat, accessible area has been used for camping for many years. The recreation site facilities today are were similar to those of 1965 and include 16 camp sites with tables and grills, restrooms, garbage cans, fire rings and hand pumped potable well water. The rec site was recently overhauled to bring into compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act. Visitor use is conservatively estimated at 1,500 people annually. This is based on numbers reported by visitors signing the rec site register and on observations by volunteers working at the park. About half the visitors are stopping for a short break or for a picnic lunch, and half are campers. The average annual use of the Park Creek site in 1978 was 480 picnickers and 720 campers per year (USDI 1978). Park Creek is not widely advertised. Most visitors are from the southwest Oregon and many are repeat visitors. The campground is separated by the creek into the west unit, or Side A, and the east unit, or side B. BLM paved road 27-10-4.0 and a bridge provide access.

Big Tree Recreation Site - The Big Tree Rec Site is located along Cherry Creek Road, 19 miles east of Coquille. The park contains 20 acres that were withdrawn in 1965 by Public Order 3869. Approximately 1/4 acre in the park is developed. The facilities in the developed area are basic and set up for day use only. The Big Tree Park receives approximately 500 visitors per year. The 1978 use was 600 visits per year (USDI 1978). In addition to recreational use, the park is used for educational field trips because it provides easy access to intact old-growth and riparian stands and to a fish bearing stream. Cherry Creek Research Natural Area borders Big Tree Park and is one of the larger blocks of intact old growth on the Coos Bay District.

Big Tree Recreation Site Plan was signed in July, 1999. It indicates management actions will continue to provide “existing opportunities for primitive, low-impact, day-use outdoor recreation activities such as picnicking, trail walking, interpretation/education, and wildlife/nature viewing.” The site currently has three picnic tables, three fire rings and three foot bridges. The parking area for the park is on the Cherry Creek Mainline Road and connected to the park by a short trail. The vault toilet for the park is in the parking area.

McKinley Camp - is a 12 acre site located along Middle Creek Road, just south of BLM’s maintenance facility in T.27 S., R.11 W., S.21., and has an interesting history of human use. The McKinley Camp site is part of a 120 acre parcel entered under timber patent 1023802 in 1929⁴. The timber patent terminated in 1937. In 1939, ten acres, roughly corresponding to the location of the present McKinley Camp site, were designated the McKinley Nursery. A letter in BLM files dated April 24, 1956 states the structures were “built by Conscientious Objectors during World War II... The purpose of the buildings was to house nursery personnel, as it was our intention to undertake the management of a forest nursery on this property. Lack of funds is the main reason the project was discarded.” Based on other documents, the date of construction was probably 1942. The conscientious objectors referred to by the letter worked for the Civilian Public Service. The Civilian Public Service was organized during World War II to provide a means for conscientious objectors to perform service in lieu of entering the military. The work accomplished by the Civilian Public Service was similar to that done by Civilian Conservation Corp enrollees during the 1930s.

Records indicate McKinley Camp once had several buildings including a house and barracks. From 1946 to 1956 the camp was leased to the Coos County Youth Association and the Elk’s Club for use as a youth camp. The Bureau of Public Roads took over the camp from 1956 to 1960 and used it to house supervisory personnel and engineers who were working on a forest access road project. From 1961 through 1982 the Campfire Girls leased the site for a youth camp called Camp Tawanka. By the early 1970’s the camp facilities were deteriorating and some structures were demolished in 1973. A 1978 estimate for



Figure 3 Civilian Public Service fire road grading crew with a TD-18 tractor pulling a grader in 1943. Photo by Bill Wildman, former CPS enrollee.

⁴ The following are the timber volumes and prices: 2,500 mbf of yellow fir at \$2.00/ mbf; 200 mbf red fir at \$2.00/ mbf; 75 mbf of cedar at \$1.50/ mbf; and 150 mbf of hemlock at \$0.50/ mbf. At one time loggers thought Douglas-firs with yellow heartwood were a different species from those with red heartwood thus the practice of cruising yellow fir separate from red fir. The volume totaled 2,925 mbf or 24.3 mbf/ acre. This is low compared to the volume per acre found in more recent timber sales of old-growth on upland sites. The low volume is likely due to the site being dominated by myrtles and maples, neither which had sufficient commercial value in 1929 to merit including in the cruise. A few large grand fir grow on this site but that species also had little commercial value in 1929.

rehabilitating the camp was nearly a quarter million dollars. The last buildings were demolished in 1983. Many people that grew up in Coos County remember camping at the McKinley Camp site as kids.

The site of the camp is still used for primitive group camping. Currently, about 2.5 acres are mowed annually to inhibit the spread of blackberries. The rest of the site supports a stand of mature myrtles with scattered conifers. The District RMP lists McKinley Camp as a “potential” recreation site rather than an existing site. It is used periodically by groups and there are no developments at this time. A trail through the woods to the south does exist, but is not maintained. There are no current plans to develop McKinley Camp.

Blue Ridge Trail - The Blue Ridge Trail came about because of interest and support for a trail close to the Coos Bay/ North Bend area by a diverse group of potential users. These groups included motorized trail bike riders, mountain bike riders, equestrians, and hikers. AmeriCorp Volunteers did the initial trail construction 2000. Northwest Youth Corp, out of Eugene, Oregon, did trail improvements in 2001. The BLM has an agreement South Coast Bikers to do the trail maintenance. Map USE-2 shows the portion of the trail route inside the North Fork Coquille Watershed.

Off-Road-Vehicle (ORV) Use - ORV operators are attracted to challenging travel routes. However, steep heavily vegetated terrain limits ORV use in the Watershed to existing roads and most existing roads are suitable for 2-wheel drive vehicles and thus lack the challenge that would attract ORV users. Most all BLM roads in the Watershed are rocked or paved. The few dirt-surface BLM controlled roads are undriveable because trees, brush, bank sluff and windthrows physically block the roads. The amount of ORV use on private roads is not known. Some landowners gate their roads or post their property limiting access to challenging travel routes on private land. ORV operators do use the powerline maintenance trails. Rutting and exposed soil indicate ORV operators are using the powerline trails but they are only rarely observed suggesting the use is not heavy. ORV use of a powerline maintenance trail is resulting in sediment delivery to a tributary of Middle Creek in section 29, T.27S.,R.11W.

Reference Conditions (Prehistoric and Early Historic Use)

Prehistoric Resource Use: The major valleys in the Watershed supplied a wide range of resources useful to hunter-gatherer populations. Plant processing tools, including stone mortar and pestles, have been found in sites throughout the valley area. These attest to the gathering and processing of vegetable resources in the immediate vicinity, including seeds and/or nuts, and perhaps grasses used as raw material for basketry, cordage, and structure construction. The southern end of Fairview Valley was an area of camas gathering by Native Americans. Camas is a wild root crop that prefers damp, clayey soil and can be processed and dried for long-term storage. The North Fork Coquille River and its branch streams provided locales for obtaining fish and eels. The presence of falls and riffles helped concentrate fishing efforts into specific, well-used places. The prairie within Fairview Valley, named Burton Prairie during the 1860s (Teters 1951), undoubtedly also was existent during prehistoric times, and may have been created and maintained using intentional burning. This open prairie and extensive ecotone attracted deer and elk populations to browse. Judging by the stone tools identified at prehistoric sites, elk and deer hunting also was an important prehistoric activity here.

Most resource acquisition strategies used by Native American populations have left few visible impacts. This is not because Native American land use had no effect on these resources, but because most effects would be very difficult to see today. Floral resources were fortuitously gathered, not cultivated. This leaves little evidence of environmental change directly attributable to prehistoric activity. Similarly, aquatic resource use by prehistoric residents has not resulted in visible land-disturbance activities. While aboriginal fishing practices may have altered the frequency or composition of some species, these activities ceased 130 years ago, and the effects would be difficult to isolate today. In contrast, it is at least

potentially easier to observe the effect of Native American burning practices on the landscape today. The ethnographic and anthropological literature indicates many Native American groups practiced forms of intentional burning. Man-made fires were important for several reasons, as will be discussed below.

Another potentially visible result of Native American land use is the system of trails that crisscrossed the Coast Range. The Watershed is bisected by the Coos Bay Wagon Road, which was one of the major east-west routes connecting the southern Oregon coast to Willamette Valley. This route largely follows a much older Indian trail, which linked Coos Bay to "Umpqua Country" (around Camas Valley), where connection could be made to the major north-south trail between California and British Columbia (Teters 1951). The fishing grounds at LaVerne Falls was a major meeting center where coast and Willamette Valley tribes fished, renewed acquaintances and traded. By itself, the trail systems had little effect on the landforms or vegetation. Of course, they permitted access to areas in which other practices effected the landscape, and so had that additional impact.

Nearly all known prehistoric cultural resources in the Watershed are located within the major broad valleys. The known prehistoric sites elsewhere in the Watershed are rare and were likely hunting or fishing camps. There are several reasons for this observed site distribution pattern. Residential areas, whether short- or long-term, create the most obvious sites through repeated use and the creation of features, such as fireplaces or housepits. Other stream and river channels, particularly in the North Coquille Subwatershed and the east half of Middle Creek Subwatershed, are narrow valleys with moderately to very steep walls, where access always has been difficult. Although it is reported that Native American groups camped in many places along the North Fork (Teters 1951), evidence likely was destroyed as an unintended effect of subsequent logging practices, particularly the use of splash dams for log transport (see Beckham 1990; Farnell 1979). When impounded water behind a splash dam was released, often it scoured the stream channel to bedrock, which washed away all evidence of previous activities.

Although hunting and gathering may have taken place on slopes and ridge tops above the flood plains and terraces, these activities left few features or artifacts behind. The inference made by archaeologists is that isolated broken tools and small scatters of resharpening debris mark such locations. The sparsity of such debris combined with the thick ground cover and steep topography makes recognition of such areas difficult. Perhaps it is the Native American fire regimen that has left the best still-observable traces from prehistoric uses of these heavily-vegetated areas.

Intentional burning, or anthropogenic fire, has been documented as an important tool for native groups in many areas of the world (Lewis 1990). A variety of methods were used to burn vegetation, depending on the location and purpose. The better-known purposes include signaling, ease of movement, food gathering, vegetation management, maintenance of habitat diversity, hunting, forage and animal population management and warfare. Aboriginal peoples matched fire location, intensity, frequency and timing to their needs and the specific environment (Lewis 1985). Aboriginal people throughout the northwest were hunter-gatherers, and so burned places for their daily activities; camping, traveling, hunting and gathering.

Little detail is known today about coastal burning practices, but in the nearby Willamette Valley they are better documented (see Boyd 1986, Habeck 1961, Johannessen et al. 1971, Lewis 1990, Thilenius 1968 and Veirs 1982). Examination of these details may shed some light on coastal forest burning patterns. However, such interpretation should be approached with caution. Although both areas are within western Oregon and geographically adjacent, as Lewis (1990) notes, the Willamette Valley and coastal forests are quite different environments and anthropogenic fire was used in differing ways.

In the Willamette Valley, extensive areas of understory were burned regularly both to produce new growth

and to prevent the built-up of fuels, which could lead to a disastrous natural conflagration (Lieberman 1990). Fires were set regularly, burning understory vegetation. These fires did little harm to established trees, and produced both open forest and prairies. Seral grasslands were maintained in areas that otherwise would have developed into forest through vegetal succession (Arno 1983; Boyd 1986).

Other reasons for anthropogenic fires in Willamette Valley prairies include enhancing the search for wild honey, berries, and insects including grasshoppers (Lieberman 1990), and as part of the procedure for harvesting root crops, tarweed (*Madia* spp.) and other seed crops (Boyd 1986; Lieberman 1990). Indeed, Native American use of anthropogenic fire in the Willamette Valley was so widespread and regular that it maintained a "fire climax" biotype (Boyd 1986).

In contrast to the Willamette Valley pattern, relatively small areas were burned within the wetter coastal forest. These included prairies, ridge tops and the terraces abutting stream channels (Lewis 1990). Here, the desired result was creation and maintenance of treeless areas within these otherwise heavily forested landscapes. Lewis and Ferguson (1988) hypothesize that in densely forested areas, such as coastal forest, prairies also were created along trail routes to make travel easier. Ridge tops were burned largely because they were the location of established trails.

There are two basic processes that lead to survival of prairie vegetation in an otherwise forested environment. They are regular inundation and regular burning (Norton et al. 1983). Without one (or both), fast-growing young trees would eliminate many prairie species, which are intolerant of even partial shade (Norton et al. 1983). While inundation of stream terraces was fairly regular because of the heavy winter precipitation, upland prairies and ridgetops would have to be burned to insure prairie vegetation survival.

In both the Willamette Valley and coastal forests, a major result of burning was enhancement of game hunting, both because removal of brush made it easier for people to move around and see game, and because it promoted fresh green shoots which attracted more game. In the coastal forest, development of a patchy mosaic of small open prairies surrounded by forested areas expanded the prairie/forest ecotone, which created an unusual abundance of "edges." This vegetation pattern provided optimum habitat for deer as well as enhancing the variety of other animals which would use the area.

A few miles north of the Fairview area, in Siuslaw country, ethnographer John Harrington was told by Coos-Kalawatset informant Frank Drew that they "used to keep all the brush ... burned down so these was no retarding underbrush & deers were then visible from afar" (notes in possession of H. Zenk, cited by Boyd 1986:77).

Along the Oregon coast to the south of the assessment area, aboriginal tobacco cultivation was practiced by many southwest Oregon Athapaskan-speaking groups (Barnett 1937). Planting involved burning the plot and sowing tobacco seeds in the resultant ashes. Obviously, these people knew that wood ash is a good fertilizer for seeds. Even further south, in northern California, the evidence assembled by Lewis (1973) provides "highly suggestive, if not in fact corroborating evidence for patterned burning within the functionally equivalent environments occupied by the coastal Indians of western Oregon" (Boyd 1986:82). Although Native American anthropogenic fire may have been less widespread in the coastal forest than in the Willamette Valley, it still appears to have been an important technology which persisted for hundreds, if not thousands, of years. It is apparent from the forgoing review of anthropogenic fire that Native Americans in what we now call the North Fork Coquille Watershed displayed a sophisticated understanding of the complex interaction of fire, vegetation and animals, and had considerable skill in using this understanding to produce desired results.

Confirmation today that a specific area was subject to anthropogenic fire in the past first requires differentiating between natural lightning-caused fires and intentional human-caused burns. Lewis and Ferguson (1988) suggest that the "pattern and scale of burned and unburned patches" holds a key. Natural fires usually are hotter (more destructive), larger and less-frequent, whereas man-made fires usually are the reverse; they repeatedly, lightly burn patches of growth, are smaller and more frequent. Visually, many early explorers marvelled at the abrupt boundary with the surrounding forest and the cultivated-like nature of the grassy prairies (Lewis and Ferguson 1988), which were created as a result of knowledgeable fire management.

In the North Fork Coquille Watershed, regular burning probably ceased in the 1860s, with removal and relocation of the Native American communities which previously resided there. Because regular burning is required to maintain these prairies, today we would not be able to easily identify many, as the forest has reclaimed them during the last 130 years since regular burning ceased. An additional problem in identification of Native American anthropogenic fire localities is that some early Euro-American settlers observed the beneficial effects of intentional burning and continued the practice. As well, the Euro-American forest practices discussed above unintentionally removed much evidence of Native American land-use practices on forested slopes and ridgetops as well as within the river valleys. The vegetation section includes additional discussion on human use of fire to alter vegetation.

Early Roads and Trails: Probably the single most important event affecting the timing and pattern of historical settlement in Fairview, Middle Creek, Dora and Sitkum areas was the construction of the Coos Bay Wagon Road. Orvil Dodge (1898, pg 169), an early author on Coos County history wrote:

The occupancy of this region by home seekers practically had its beginning late in the 'sixties' and received its chief impulse from the occasion of the route of the Coos Bay wagon road, accelerated afterwards by the actual commencement of the work of construction by contractors at various points along the line, thus assuring its early completion.

In the late 1860's and early 1870's, the Coos Bay Wagon Road was both a positive and a negative factor influencing settlement. The promise of the soon-to-be-built road access, although attractive to some settlers, caused others to leave because of uncertainty over their land tenure. With the land being unsurveyed at that time, there was a real risk that the Bay Wagon Road Company, under the grant the Federal Government made to them in exchange for building the road, could select and patent the land the settler was living on and trying to improve (Dodge 1898). Other early settlers got discouraged and left because of the amount and size of timber that had to be cleared before the land could be farmed (Dodge 1898; Wooldridge 1971). However, when one settler quit and move on, a new settler would usually take his place (Dodge 1898).

The Coos Bay Wagon Road generally follows a trail located by Horace Brewster in 1868⁵. That trail was quickly improved to accommodate pack horses⁶ (Dodge 1898). In 1872, the wagon road was useable as far as Burton Prairie, now Fairview. The obituary for Anne Barklow, reprinted by Wooldridge (1971), tells about her and her husband Samuel coming as far as Fairview on the Coos Bay Wagon Road and then having to blaze a trail the rest of the way into Coquille. When the road was finally completed through to Sumner, in 1873, it was the first road into Coos County (Peterson; Powers 1977).

⁵ The Brewster Valley Trail is described by the early pioneer, Marry Norris as follows: "In 1868 my people moved in this country settling about a mile and a quarter north of Burton Prairie. We came in over the Brewster Valley Trail, following the Mountain tops. The trails were wide enough for only a horse. Logs lay across them in many places. Our goods were carried in on pack trains. We were the only settlers in the valley at that time." (Wooldridge 1971, pp. 191)

⁶ A German, named Bennett, was a packer on the Brewster Trail, whose services were in demand. Bennett named all of the male horses John and the females were all named Suse. That allowed him to call in the horses that were lagging behind along the trail without actually having to know which animals were not keeping up. Bennett claimed that feeding these pack horses grain would make them worthless for mountain packing because they would then refuse to eat available forage found along the trail (Dodge 1898).

The location of the Coos Bay Wagon Road through T.27S., R.11W. Will. Mer. today is close to, if not the same as, its original placement based on the road location shown on the cadastral survey notes (Cathcart 1892b and Chapman 1875). Chapman's (1875) notes and map shows the first 3/4 mile of what is now the Middle Creek Road already built and a trail in place up the west side of Middle Creek in 1875. A trail labeled "Coos Bay Trail" was located on the north side and parallel to Coak Creek tying from Middle Creek through to what is now the Fairview LaVerne Park County Road. This Coos Bay Trail is not the same Coos Bay Trail that was located on the divide between the Coos River Drainage and the North Fork Coquille.

The cadastral survey notes and township maps do not show all of the trails, Chapman's (1875) notes describe the Coos Bay Trail continuing east of Middle Creek but that trail segment is not shown on the township map. Cathcart's (1892), survey of the land adjacent to Chapman's survey makes no mention of the Coos Bay Trail.

Cathcart's (1892) survey of the east half of T.27S., R.11W., Will. Mer. show a 3/4 mile long segment of a "county road" from the Brewster Trail to "Bunches' Meadow". Bunches' Meadow was northeast of Cherry Creek opposite where Little Cherry Creek comes in. The segment of the Brewster Trail shown was from Cherry Creek in section 27 to section 15.

Road Access - Most of the following information is from what was written in the Forest Product section of the *Burnt Mountain Unit Resource Analysis* (USDI, 1978).

Until the 1940's, sales of government timber were made without any real management objectives. Purchasers were required to obtain their own access to the sale area and once sales were terminated, the government was left without legal access to the tracts.

During the next ten years BLM started making long range management plans and pushed road developments into the more remote areas, however, the checkerboard ownership resulting from the revestment of the Oregon & California Railroad land grant made access a real problem. Access into larger blocks was made by entering into reciprocal agreements with large landowners while temporary easements were obtained for crossing small landowners.

By the late 1950's, Bureau policy dictated legal access be obtained prior to selling timber at competitive bid. This brought restrictive access to a close and led to the intensive access acquisition program in use today. Temporary easements for crossing small landowners have now been replaced by two types of perpetual easements: Exclusive and Non-exclusive.

Exclusive easements give the BLM a right to construct and maintain a road across private ownership and extend such access to the public. Non-exclusive easements give the BLM a right to use and maintain an existing road for log hauling and administrative purposes, but does not give access to public. Besides exclusive and non-exclusive easements, BLM also has reciprocal agreements with the large timber companies. Reciprocal rights or agreements are similar to non-exclusive easements, except they give BLM a right to construct a road across company lands and give the companies the same right on BLM lands. Neither company nor government may give rights for public access, regardless of the party constructing the road. Generally, the party that constructs the road, regardless whose lands it is on, maintains control of the road. Also control of the road does not overlook the rights of other parties, those who have made capital investments to roads on BLM lands, to use the roads. Part of the intent of reciprocal rights or agreements were to reduce the construction of parallel road systems.

Early Agriculture - The first lands to be settled in Coos County were adjacent to navigable streams. Those

parcels were all taken within the first 30 years. Later settlers who acquired land away from easy access to water transportation had to contend first with primitive trails, and later dirt roads that became impassable during winter rains. The early settlers produced potatoes, dairy products, beef, pork, mutton, and chickens. Fish, game, and berries were also available. The principal crop grown for market by the pioneer farmer was potatoes. The best potato land was on stream banks but potatoes would wear out the soil if not rotated with other crops. In the 1890's dairy products replaced potatoes as Coos County's leading agricultural commodity. Settlers found the best sites for their gardens to be where alder had grown. Farmers usually spent part of the year away from home working in the coal mines or logging camps (Peterson; Powers 1952).

Navigation: The following history of navigation on the North Fork Coquille is taken from the *Coos and Coquille River Studies* by Farnell (1979), which he compiled from several primary sources cited in his paper. In 1902, the 22 foot steam boat, *J. Warren*, began regular passage on the North Fork Coquille between Gravelford and Myrtle Point. By 1904, The Corp of Engineers began regulating log drives on the North Fork down stream of Gravelford in order to aid passage of vessels. The owners of the *J. Warren* operated on this route in the winter months, between November and April until about 1912. December 1910, the sternwheeler, *Myrtle* made her first trip to Gravelford. The *Myrtle*, which was 57.4 feet long and drew 2.9 feet, repeated the passage several time during the following decade. These beginnings encouraged the formation of the Port of Coquille River, which began operations in 1912. The Port of Coquille River requested the Corp of Engineers to improve the North Fork Coquille for navigation to River Mile 17 (the low Lee Valley). The Corp of Engineers, having ceased dredging operations above Coquille City, turned down this request in 1914.

The Port of Coquille River adopted the following ordinance on June 18, 1913:

It shall not be lawful to place, discharge, or deposit by any process or in any manner, ballast, refuse, dirt, ashes, cinders, mud, sand, dredgings, sludge, sawdust, slabs, strips, stucups, or any other refuse, matter of any kind or description whatever, other than that flowing from streets and sewers and passing therefrom in a liquid state, or to abandon lodge sawlogs in any navigable water of the Port of Coquille River, or in any tributary of any navigable water of said Port, where the same shall be liable to be washed into such navigable water, either by ordinary or high tide or by storm or floods, or otherwise, whereby navigation shall or may be impeded or obstructed.

The Port of Coquille River adopted the following resolution on July 16, 1913:

The Port of Coquille River Commission intends making continual seasonal improvement, during low water of the South, North, and East Fork of the North Fork of the Coquille River, in the following manner, to wit: – By cutting overhanging trees and brush, piling and burning the same when the nature of the banks will permit otherwise by cutting the brush or trees into short lengths. By falling or girdling such trees on top of the river bank, which by their weights are liable to cause the banks to cave in. This will comprise principally myrtles and maples. By cutting off below extreme low water or pulling and placing on the banks for burning where the nature of the banks will permit, all snags from the main channel of these streams. By blasting or bulldozing such boulders as may be necessary.

This ordinance and resolution defined the scope of the Port's activities.

As a result of the Port's efforts to improve navigability, The *Myrtle* was able to reach Fox Bridge (River Mile 14.3) during February 1918. During the 1920s the Port extending river clearing operations to Middle Creek and the upper portions of the North Fork. These efforts provided the farmers along the main branches of the Coquille River with a better means of personal and commercial transport during the winter months when the roads were at their worst, and facilitated water transport of logs. After a hiatus that began with World War II, the Port of Coquille River began a regular program of stream clearance, in the mid-1960s, on the 4 main branches of the Coquille River above tide water "to bring the system up to navigation standards." Farnell (1979) reported the Port was conducting winter clearance operations, which at highest water, extended to Fairview on the North Fork Coquille and McKinley on Middle Creek. While these efforts were primarily intended to prevent flooding and bank erosion, they permitted two-way boat traffic up to the head of Lee Valley on the North Fork Coquille, and to McKinley on Middle Creek.

Water Transport of Logs: The following summary of log drives and splash dams on the North Coquille is

from *Coos and Coquille Rivers Navigability Studies* by Farnell (1979) and *Swift Flows the River* by Beckham (1990).

- June 1898 – two and one-half day log drive to Fox Bridge (RM 14.3).
- Fall 1902 – log drive from Fairview.
- Winters of 1902 and 1903 – 1,000 logs taken down river from RM 35.
- Late in 1903 1,200 fir logs cut on the Mast property on the North Fork, between RM 15 and RM 17, floated to mills on the lower Coquille.
- 1903 – 4,300 logs started down river from RM 42, but only 1,500 came out during the first year and 1,000 the second year.
- 1903 – 900 logs started down river from RM 34, which were scattered to tidewater.

Other operators also put logs into the North Fork Coquille in 1903. Altogether, 8,000 logs were started down river. However, only part of the logs from each drive made it all of the way down river, and several large jams formed because 1903 was a low water year. The logs put into the river in 1904 only compounded the problem and caused the Corp of Engineers to limit the hours of log driving in 1904 to allow steamboat travel to Gravelford. In 1905, G. A. Signalness hired Bill Vaughan and J. A. McDonald and to build a sizeable splash dam at RM 36 that could be used to clear the river. Later that year, Vaughan and McDonald built a second dam 5 miles farther upstream. The river was cleared that fall. In 1907 Vaughan and McDonald bought Signalness out. They spilled their dams three times that year, at least twice in April, in an attempt to clear the river of logs. This caused two riparian owners to file suit for damage to their river banks. The suit reached the Oregon Supreme Court. Navigability of the North Fork Coquille was conceded by the court but Vaughan and McDonald were also enjoined from further releases from their slash dam without prior consent from downstream land owners. Farnell reports other log drives on the North Fork Coquille in 1905, 1907, 1908, 1909 and during 1924-25. Dennis McCarthy drove logs from above Fairview with the aid of a splash dam.

The Port of Coquille River got involved in water transport of logs on the North Fork Coquille after 1920 by issuing permits for splash dams and regulating log booms. The Port of Coquille River issued a permit to Dennis McCarthy to build a splash dam on the North Fork Coquille in 1922 and aided McCarthy's splash dam operations by blasting the boulders in the canyon above Lee Valley. The Port allowed 2 other operators to build splash dams on the North Fork Coquille in 1924. One of these operators built 2 dams. One above Fairview at RM 27.5 and the other above Laverne Falls at RM 31.5. The riparian owners became outraged by the cooperative relation between the Port and splash dam operators, and began complaining regularly to the Port in 1925. In 1928, the streamside landowners brought suit against the Port of Coquille River and won damages for losses to their lands caused by splashed log drives.

Log drives also came down Middle Creek. Lawhorn drove logs down Middle Creek from RM 13 as early as December 1902. The most extensive runs occurred after 1913. Aason Brothers logged near the McKinley area on Middle Creek in 1917-18, and had a splash dam was located near RM 15⁷. Dennis McCarthy also drove logs from the McKinley area in the 1920s. Splash dam operations on the North Fork Coquille and Middle Creek extended into the 1930s.

Farnell (1979) in his final analysis on stream navigability, as it pertains to which stream beds could be claimed by the State's, observed:

- During the first 20 years of the 20th century, steamboats and gasoline launches carried freight, mail and passengers up the North Fork Coquille to RM 14.3.
- The Port of Coquille River extended river navigation, primarily benefitting recreational boating, to RM 21.5 on the North Fork Coquille.

⁷ Beckham (1990) reports that the Aasen Brothers built a splash dam on Middle Creek about 1911. Whether this is the same splash dam at RM 15 reported by Farnell (1979) is not clear.

- Log drives originated as high up the North Fork Coquille as RM 42.
- Logs came down Middle Creek from as high as RM 13 for two decades. Farnell had noted a splash dam on Middle Creek at RM 15 in the body of his report.

Logging and Grazing: The Vegetation section of this document addresses logging and grazing history on BLM lands in the North Fork Coquille Watershed. The Human Use Appendix contains land use and logging history information originally contained in watershed analysis documents replaced by the North Fork Coquille Watershed Analysis.

Recreation: Historically, recreation activities followed a seasonal pattern. Spring and summer activities included camping, picnicking and trout fishing. Fall activities were mushroom and berry picking, operating off-road vehicles (ORVs), deer and elk hunting, and salmon and steelhead fishing. Except for the use of ORVs, this pattern of recreation developed out of the wild food gathering and hunting patterns practiced by the early settlers to supplement agricultural production. This in turn was based on the Native American hunting and gathering patterns. These patterns were so ingrained that as recently as the 1980s, mills would schedule their maintenance shutdowns to coincide with the first week of elk season when nearly all their labor took time off to go hunting, and some businesses would suspend operations during the opening weekends for deer and the fishing seasons.

Synthesis and Interpretation

Regionally, exploitation of natural resources grew without overall management until the mid-20th century, as populations continued to grow and communities increasingly depended on timber and fishing jobs for economic support. Intensive forest resource management really began after World War II, as new mechanized equipment and improved transportation systems increased potential harvest localities that could be reached. At the same time renewed economic conditions provided additional demand for forest products, the American public was also discovering their country via the new interstate highway system. By the 1960s, interest in environmental protection and increasing demand for recreation opportunities in natural settings were colliding with increasing demands for products derived from natural resources, resulting in many of the environmental/natural resources laws which are in place today. Since the mid-1980's, the rising public interest in environmental issues and desire to protect natural settings have resulted in a decrease in timber production on Federal lands. Concerns about endangered species, water quality, forest practices, lost jobs and the general health of our natural and economic resources has prompted cooperative efforts among private, state and federal entities to work together for improvement of these concerns in Oregon and nationally. Local programs include the Coquille Watershed Association, the federally sponsored "Jobs in the Woods," the State administered volunteer program involving fish hatcheries called "Salmon and Trout Enhancement Project (STEP)," and Citizen Advisory Committees for local land use planning.



Figure 4 The entrance to the Civilian Public Service camp in 1943. This camp was originally built as a Civilian Conservation Camp in the 1930s. After World War II the camp was used for a time as a logging camp. Nothing remains of the camp structures. The site is on private property near Middle Creek Falls. Photo by Bill Wildman, former CPS enrollee.

The Coquille River has been an important focus of human activity and use since prehistoric times. Historical human uses in the analysis include fishing and hunting, timber harvesting, and small-scale farming. Despite fundamental changes to the prehistoric natural systems from draining the wetlands, suppressing fires, building roads and cutting large tracts of timber, human uses today in this analysis area are much the same as one hundred years ago. What has changed is that long-term planning for maintaining a sustainable natural resource base for all communities is slowly beginning to replace short-term land use strategies of the past.

As tourism becomes a more important part of southwest Oregon's economy, historic and prehistoric sites can play an increasing role in providing a varied suite of resources to interest visitors. However, prehistoric and historic cultural resources are, by their nature, fragile and non-renewable. Unless positive steps are taken to prevent their destruction, current and future human land use and natural disturbance processes are likely to result in the loss of many remaining cultural resources. Application of existing cultural resource law can retard or ameliorate ongoing destruction processes on public land. However, many of the more heavily used and important localities today are in private ownership. Tax credits and other assistance may be available to private citizens who consent to the preservation of important cultural resources on their land.

This analysis area has been the scene of many important human events that mirror many of the region's major historic trends. The potential exists for preservation and future investigation of cultural resource localities through the interest, support and cooperation of both public and private landowners. Results of such investigations can provide a more complete understanding of prehistoric and historic events, and may result in creation of additional interpretive facilities that can stimulate interest in the area's past by presenting cultural information to visitors and residents alike.

The Watershed is important to people for the ability to provide forest products, recreation, and a pleasant living environment. Trends indicate growth is slow for Coos County. Public issues include defining the acceptable level of growth for the region.

References

- Arno, S.F. 1983 Ecological effects and management implications of Indian fires. In *Proceedings - symposium and workshop on wilderness fire, Missoula, Montana, November 15-18, 1983*. USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, General Technical Report INT-182, pp. 81-86. Ogden, UT.
- Beckham, D. 1990 *Swift flows the river*. Arago Books, Coos Bay, OR.
- Boyd, R.J. 1986 Strategies of Indian burning in the Willamette Valley. *Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 5:65-86.
- Barnett, H. 1937. Cultural element distributions VII: Oregon Coast. *Anthropological Records* 1(3):155-204.
- Chapman, W. 1875. Field Notes of the Survey of the Subdivision Lines of Township 27 South, Range 11 West, Willamette Meridian, Oregon. Office of the U. S. Surveyor-General, Portland, OR (Now the Bureau of Land Management).
- Cathcart, S.B. 1892. Field Notes of the Survey of the Subdivision Lines of Township 27 South, Range 11 West, Willamette Meridian, Oregon. Office of the U. S. Surveyor-General, Portland, OR (Now the Bureau of Land Management).
- Connolly, T.J. 1991. The Standley site: investigations into the prehistory of Camas Valley, southwest Oregon. *University of Oregon Anthropological Papers* 43. Oregon State Museum of Anthropology, Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- Coquille Indian Tribe. 1997. "Substance of Coquille Indian Tribe Cultural Values." Coquille Indian Tribe, North Bend, OR.
- Dodge, O. 1898. *Pioneer History of Coos and Curry Counties, Or.* 2nd ed. 1969. Bandon, Or. 468 pages.
- Farnell, J.R. 1979 *Coos and Coquille Rivers Navigability Studies*. Division of State Lands, Salem, OR.
- Habeck, J.R. 1961 The original vegetation of the mid-Willamette Valley, Oregon. *Northwest Science* 35:65-77.
- International Tourism and Resort Advisors (INTRA). 1998. *Tourism Strategic and Implementation Plan Coos County*. 103 pgs and 3 appendices.
- Johannessen, C.L.; Davenport, W.A.; Millet, A.; McWilliams, S. 1971 The vegetation of Willamette Valley. *Annals*

of the Association of American Geographers 61:1(286-302).

- Lewis, H.T. 1973 *Patterns of Indian burning in California: ecology and ethnohistory*. Ballena Press, Ramona, CA.
- Lewis, H.T. 1985 Why Indians burned: specific versus general reasons. In *Proceedings - symposium and workshop on wilderness fire, Missoula, Montana, November 15-18, 1983*. USDA Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, General Technical Report INT-182, pp. 75-80. Ogden, UT.
- Lewis, H.T. 1990. Reconstructing patterns of Indian burning in southwestern Oregon. In *Living with the land: the Indians of southwest Oregon, the proceedings of the 1989 symposium on the prehistory of southwest Oregon*, edited by Nan Hannon and Richard K. Olmo, pp. 80-84. Southern Oregon Historical Society, Medford.
- Lewis, H.T.; Ferguson, T.A. 1988 Yards, corridors, and mosaics: how to burn a boreal forest. *Human Ecology*, 16(1):57-77.
- Liberman, K. 1990 The native environment: contemporary perspectives of southwestern Oregon's Native Americans. In *Living with the land: the Indians of southwest Oregon, the proceedings of the 1989 symposium on the prehistory of southwest Oregon*, edited by Nan Hannon and Richard K. Olmo, pp. 85-93. Southern Oregon Historical Society, Medford.
- Norton, H.H.; Robert Boyd, R.; Hunn, E.S. 1983. The Klickitat trail of south-central Washington: A reconstruction of seasonally used resource sites. In *Prehistoric places on the southern Northwest coast*, edit by Robert E. Greengo, pp. 121-152.
- Peterson, E.R.; Powers, A. 1977. *A Century of Coos and Curry History of Southwest Oregon*. copyright 1952 by Coos-Curry Pioneer and Historical Assoc., Coquille. Caxton Printers, Ltd. Caldwell ID. 599 pgs.
- State of Oregon Employment Dept. 1999a. *Coos Bay/Gold Beach Labor Trends Coos & Curry Counties, Sept 1999.7* pgs. <http://www.olmis.org/olmisj/PubReader?itemid=00000431>.
- State of Oregon Employment Dept. 1999b. 2000 Regional Economic Profile Region 7 Coos County Curry County. Nov. 1999. 63 pgs. <http://www.olmis.pubs/rep1999/pdf/rep07.pdf>.
- State of Oregon Employment Dept. 2000. Coos County Economic Profile, summer 2000. 2 pgs. <http://www.olmis.org/pubs/Profiles/coos.pdf>.
- Teters, N. McC. 1951. *Fairview Valley, Coos County, Oregon*. Privately published.
- Thilenius, J.F. 1968. The *Quercus garryana* forests of Willamette Valley, Oregon. *Ecology* 49:1123-1133.
- USDI. 1978. *Unit Resource Analysis Burnt Mountain Planning Unit*. on file Coos Bay District Office.
- USDI. 1995. *Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan*. Coos Bay Dist. Office, North Bend, OR.
- Veirs Jr., S.D. 1982 Coast redwood forest: stand dynamics, successional status, and the role of fire. In *Proceedings, forest succession and stand development research in the Northwest*, edited by J. Means, pp. 119-141. Oregon State University, Corvallis.
- Wooldridge, A.H. 1971. *Pioneers and Incidents of the Upper Coquille Valley*. The Mail Printers, Coquille, OR. 385 pgs.

Other sources consulted:

- Coos Bay District-BLM: EA #OR-125-99-08 file.
- Coos Bay District-BLM: central files
- Coos County Parks and Recreation Department. Undated current brochure and visitor counts at LaVerne Park.
- Coquille, OR Community Profile, Revised 1996 city of Coquille.
- The World newspaper articles, 4/21/98, p.A6; 11/28/98, p. A7; and 5/22/2000 p. A1.
- Oregon Blue Book 1997-98